

STUDENT-TEACHER'S LANGUAGE AWARENESS: AN ANALYSIS OF GOOGLE TRANSLATE RESULTS REVISION

YULI SUSANTI PRIHASTUTI

Indonesia University of Education, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Google Translate as a language translator technology may have drawback effects on students' accuracy and fluency. One of them is that it may make the students narrow down their sensitivity toward the language. Meanwhile, it is believed that translation is a cognitive activity in language education. It is important for the users of Google translate especially students to be aware of the errors of the results. The sensitivity toward the errors may indicate the degree of individual's language awareness. The language awareness should be developed by the student-teacher since they need to evaluate the errors made by their students in the language teaching. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate the student teachers' language awareness through the revision they made on the Google Translate results using descriptive qualitative design. The instrument was designed in an open-ended way to show the result of Google translate on the Indonesian narrative text. The participants were 9-second semester student teachers of the Indonesia University of Education. The data were the documents from participants' revisions toward Google Translate results which were categorized using cognitive categories from Lindgren and Sullivan (2006) and analyzed using error types from Naqvy (2012). The findings showed that the participants had error sensitivity although it was limited. With reference to their error sensitivity and revisions on the errors, it showed that the participants' language awareness were insufficient. Therefore, it is recommended for the teacher education to develop the language awareness specifically.

KEYWORDS: Language Awareness, Error Sensitivity, Student Teachers & Google Translate

Received: Mar 22, 2018; **Accepted:** Apr 12, 2018; **Published:** May 05, 2018; **Paper Id.:** IJESRJUN20188

INTRODUCTION

Technology advancement brings easiness to humans' life. One of the easiness brought by the technology is the development of language translator technology. This tool aims to lower the barriers between the nations due to the different language they speak. It also provides the easiness of information changing between countries with different language. It works as a bridge between those countries. Skype and Google Translate are the examples of the vendor which provide this service. They develop the online based tool which is able to translate one language to another. Therefore, it emerges the questions whether these devices are able to replace the importance of language education.

Although these devices have attracted world's attention, they still have some limitation in the area of translating the language. As it is said by Ballantyne (2015) that the ability of Skype translator is still limited for Spanish and English, the other languages are not accommodated yet. In the same vein, Google Translate tool faces some limitations. Kaufmann (2015) stated that the accuracy of Google Translate result depends on the high relation of the languages' vocabulary and structures. Those languages which have high similarity in vocabulary and structures will have more advantages in results of translation. Then, it will be a problem for those languages

which have limited similarity. The errors in the translation results may have significantly appeared.

Meanwhile, the translation activity cannot rely on the structure and vocabulary only since it works beyond surface structure. Translation is one of the competences in the language learning and lies in the cognitive domain. As it is stated by Wilss (1994), it involves the skills of problem -solving and decision making. The skills of problem -solving and decision making, therefore, are affected by the competence of translation. Those competencies include the knowledge of target language, text-type, source language, real world, and contrastive as it is stated by Bell (1991: 36). All those knowledge incorporate to convey the underlying meaning of the source language to the target language. In conveying the meaning, the translators need to make a decision and solve the problems related to the translation by involving that knowledge.

In the process of conveying the underlying meaning by integrating those competencies, there are some errors noticed to be occurred. Naqvy (2006) proposed four types of the translation errors— grammatical errors (1), mistranslation (2), localization errors (3), and errors of inconsistency (4). It is explained further that grammatical errors deal with the structural pattern in the target language while mistranslation is occurred due to the arrogant or plain ignorance of certain parts in the semantic area. The localization errors relate to the inexistence of certain concept in the target language. Therefore, localization errors refer to the misuse of the certain word in the target language which cannot represent the original concept from the source language. The last is errors of inconsistency in which it happens because of interchangeably use the words to lead to the same semantic. It happens when the translator uses two or more different words to symbolize the same semantic meaning in source language while those words have slightly different meaning in a target language.

Then, the consciousness of these errors by employing the translation competences is a vital necessity for the translation process. The translation process should involve the translation competences to monitor and avoid the errors. Both of the consciousness of errors and translation competences are influenced by individuals' degree of language awareness. As it is stated by Faber (1998), language awareness is a prominent part of translation. Furthermore, from the explanation, it can be concluded that language awareness interconnects all aspects in translation. By looking at the translation process, the degree of individual's language awareness can be represented.

Language awareness is generally defined as the individual ability which links between the knowledge of the language as a system and its function. Carter (2003) mentioned that language awareness associates the increase of both consciousness and sensitivity towards the language forms and functions. On the same hand, Fairlough (1992) in Farahian and Rezaee (2015) preferred to use language properties and language use for language forms and functions. Fairlough (1992) also added that the consciousness of those parts is a basic element of language education. Then, language education should be able to improve language awareness of the participants of the education. This improvement becomes the determination of the success of language education.

One role of language awareness mentioned by Wright (2002) also describes that language awareness is as a goal of teacher education to develop the 'linguistic radar' of the student-teacher. The same belief is also stated by Van Lier (2001) in Xerri (2015) that language awareness in teacher education should be fostered. In the same vein, Thorburry (1997) explained that a fine understanding of language—the way it works and the way students learn as well as use it—may trigger their competent in well-employing pedagogical knowledge and skills. Then, the benefits of having this consciousness in EFL teaching is described by Tulasiewicz (1997) in Farahian and Rezaee (2015). Those are helping to improve the use of mother tongue, help to improve the language acquisition and learning through inferring to the

similarities to mother tongue and encouraging the language tolerance.

The student teachers should develop their language awareness since it is significantly important in developing the language teaching and learning. Based on Garcia (2009), knowledge of a language, knowledge about language and pedagogical practice are part of language awareness. Those three components are considerably prominent for determining the success of the teaching and learning process. The teacher should have sufficient knowledge of language since the teacher is the first model of language use for the students. With sufficient knowledge of the language, the teacher may not have the misuse of the language related to its forms and functions. The knowledge about language for the teacher associates to the knowledge of the teacher in all aspects of language. By having adequate knowledge about language, the teacher is able to give all information about the language. Then, the last is pedagogical practice. It is clear that pedagogical practice is a prominent part of the teacher. Using enough knowledge in pedagogical practice, the teacher may design the appropriate teaching and learning process. Having those three components incorporate in language awareness, the success of language teaching and learning process will be determined by the degree of teacher's language awareness.

As it is stated by Permendikbud (2016), one of the teachers' duties in the developing teaching and learning process is maintaining the process in order to be appropriate to the students' development. Determining the students' developments can be done through analyzing the students' difficulties. Their difficulties are represented by the errors the students have in their learning. Then, the teacher should increase their consciousness or sensitivity to the language errors that the students have. This consciousness relates to the sensitivity which is called as Language Awareness. In conclusion, language awareness is important to be developed by the teachers. The same condition is also applied to the student teachers who are intended to teach language class.

Due to the importance and benefits of language awareness, monitoring student-teachers' language awareness is considered vital. Several researchers have conducted a research to develop language awareness of students, pre-service teachers or student-teachers. Collaborative language production tasks were used by Kowal and Swain (2015) to improve the effectiveness of the teaching language through the raising of the learners' awareness. Meanwhile, the research conducted by Tüzel and Akcan (2009) using language awareness training while Mok (2015) using forum discussion. The research from Tüzel and Akcan (2009) illustrated that teacher education should maintain pre-service teachers' language awareness. The research used training which involved teaching practice with feedback from the university's supervisor. Mok (2015) indicated language awareness affected the teacher behavior in teaching practice.

Through all explanation above, it can be concluded that language awareness is significantly important to be developed by student teachers since the teachers need to have language awareness to manage the success of language teaching and learning process. Then, the individuals' degree of language awareness can be defined through the ability they have in the translation process. Translation process associates the consciousness of errors and translation competences. In brief, the degree of language awareness of the student teacher can be determined through their ability in analyzing translation based on the translation competences as well as their sensitivity to errors.

Considering the importance of language awareness and its benefits for student-teachers in their later teaching practices, the study aimed to know the student-teacher awareness to the extent of their sensitivity towards the errors made by the Google translate result. Having an insight toward the student teacher language awareness may give a clear reflection toward the success of language education. Since the development of language awareness is a core purpose of the language education, it is important to keep this development on track. To achieve the aim explained before, some research questions

addressed to get a clear understanding of these issues, as they are presented below.

Research Questions

- How far is the student teachers' sensitivity towards the errors of Google Translate results?
- How is the student teachers' language awareness with reference to their revision to Google Translate results?

METHODOLOGY

Design

This study was intended to analyze the document then it employed descriptive qualitative design as it was aimed to know the language awareness of student-teachers through their sensitivity toward the errors of Google Translate results. The design was chosen to give in-depth understanding of the issue.

Participants

Since the study employed descriptive qualitative design, there were nine participants assigned as the participants. The participants were assigned randomly. The participants consisted of four male students and female students. They were student-teachers of English Education Department of the Indonesia University of Education in Bandung. They were in the second semester when they were assigned as the participants of this study. Later, they were mentioned as Participant 1 to 9 in this study.

Instruments

The instrument used in this study was an Indonesian narrative text which had been translated into English through the use of Google Translate. The Indonesian narrative text was taken from a web of *BimbelBahasa* (<http://www.bimbelbahasaindonesia.com/2016/09/3-jenis-contoh-karangan-narasi-terbaru.html>). The selected text contained highly Indonesian metaphor with the intention to reveal the ability of the participants in making a revision to the errors of Google Translate results. The instruments consisted of two sections. Section A displayed the Indonesian narrative text and its English version based on the result of Google Translate without any changes. Section B showed the column containing the English version which was written again in each sentence to draw the participants' attention to the mistakes of the translation. Each sentence was followed by some available space for the students to make the revision.

Data Analysis

The data was in the form of numeric and words. It was obtained through the analysis of the student teachers' revision on the Google translate result of Indonesian narrative text. The numeric data showed the frequency of the revision made by each the participant. It represented the sensitivity of participants toward the errors Google translate results. This data was analyzed qualitatively. The word data showed the type of revision they made. The type of revision was categorized using cognitive categories from Lindgren and Sullivan (2006). Those categories consisted of grammar, spelling, typography, capitalization. The other revisions which could not be classified into those categories were placed in "others" column. Therefore, those revisions which included into "others" column were explained separately. Therefore, those revisions were analyzed using translation error categories from Naqvy (2012). Those translation error categories were grammatical errors, mistranslation, localization errors, and errors of inconsistency. The analysis of the revision using both Lindgren and Sullivan (2006) and Naqvy (2012) were intended to investigate the language awareness of the

participants.

Procedure

The participants were firstly introduced to the objective of the study before they were administered the instruments. When the participants were administered the instruments, they were asked to determine whether the translation results of Google Translate need any revision or not. The participants might take a look at Section A to compare the original Indonesian narrative text to the English version of Google Translate results. The participants started to work on the Section B in which the column displayed each sentence of an English version. The participants might be checked “correct” column when each sentence of translation result considered to have no revision while checking to “incorrect” column when the sentences considered to have any revision. When the sentences were considered to have any revision, the participants could write their revision in the right column.

The data contained some revisions made by the participants and were categorized based on the adaptation of contextual taxonomy introduced by Lindgren and Sullivan (2006). The revisions then were analyzed using translation error categories from Naqvy (2012). The contextual taxonomy was selected since the participants only revised the area of completed sentences. Some categories were added to complete the area which was not covered by the contextual taxonomy. The translation error categories were selected as the fundamental concept to analyze the revisions which were made from the translation result. The revisions were counted to see the amount of errors that the students recognized. The results would show the frequency of participants’ sensitivity of errors in Google translate result. The detailed revisions were analyzed and coded to see the language awareness of the participants through the collaboration of the type of revisions they made and the type of translation errors they revised.

FINDINGS

To address to the research question about student-teachers’ sensitivity of the errors of the Google Translate results, the amount of the revision towards the Google Translate results were counted. The results indicate the student-teachers’ sensitivity of the errors. The results are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency of Revision

Participant Sentence	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	√	-	-	-	-	-	√	-	-
2	√	-	√	√	-	√	-	-	-
3	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	-
4	√	-	-	-	-	√	√	√	√
5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	√	-
6	-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√
7	√	√	-	-	-	√	√	-	-
8	√	√	-	-	√	-	√	√	-

To further explore the student teacher language awareness, the revisions were categorized into contextual taxonomy from Lindgren and Sullivan (2006). The results are presented in Table 2. There were some revisions which could not be categorized into conceptual taxonomy from Lindgren and Sullivan (2006), and then those revisions were categorized into others.

Table 2: Type of Form Revision

	Types of Form Revision					
	Grammar	Spelling	Punctuation	Capitalization	Typography	Others
Participants 1	9	-	-	-	-	2
Participants 2	1	-	-	-	-	2
Participants 3	3	-	-	-	-	-
Participants 4	3	-	-	-	-	-
Participants 5	1	-	-	-	-	3
Participants 6	3	-	-	-	-	2
Participants 7	1	-	-	-	-	3
Participants 8	3	-	-	-	-	3
Participants 9	-	-	-	-	-	2

For further categorization, the other revisions which could not be categorized into the conceptual taxonomy of Lindgren and Sullivan (2006) are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Other Forms of Revision

Types of Revision Participant	Omission	Diction
1	-	2
2	1	1
3	-	-
4	-	-
5	2	1
6	-	2
7	1	2
8	1	2
9	1	1

For further analysis of the revisions of the Google Translate results in the description below covered the revisions of Google Translate's results which were analyzed based on Lindgren and Sullivan's conceptual taxonomy (2006). As it was presented in table 2, the revisions made by the participants lied on grammar category. The revisions which could not be included in Lindgren and Sullivan's taxonomy were put on others category. Those other revisions were the omission and diction changes.

Participant 1

Participant 1 made revisions in 6 out of 8 sentences in the Google Translate results. The types of revision were grammar and diction. She revised 9 points of grammar area and 3 points of diction. In the first sentence, she revised the 2 grammar points and 1 diction point. She changed the structure of verbs; "had not been in his bed" into "had not rised yet". She also changed the verb "was preparing" into "prepared". She chose the word "roosters" to replace the word "chickens". In the second sentence, she only changed pronoun "his" into determiner "that". In the next sentence, she chose adverb "slowly" to alternate adverb "gradually" and changed article "a" into pronoun "his". She also changed the structure of the adjective clause "that may be almost the same age as his age with his zeal as if he were young" into "that may be his age was almost the same with his young age". In the following sentence, she made two points of revision in the grammar category. She altered the verbs "stops" and "offers" into past form "stopped" and "offered". Then, she revised a grammar point in sentence 7 by altered the verb "erases" to "erased". The last sentence was revised by giving addition "more" to the noun "money". She also revised the redundant dictions of "grandparents" to "grandfather" and "grandmother". She also changed modal verb "can" into "could".

Participant 2

Participant 2 only made some revision in the last three sentences. In sentence 6, she changed the use of the verb “seemed” to “seem”. She also altered the use of to-infinitive “to feed” to “to seek”. In the last sentence, she omitted the word “just” in “just to buy rice”. The rest of the text was considered correct by the participant.

Participant 3

Participant 3 made a revision in three sentences; sentence 2, 3, and 6. In the sentence 2, she changed pronoun “his” to an article “the”. The following sentence was revised in the same way in which they changed article “a” to pronoun “his”. In the sentence 6, she changed the order of “to just look” to “just to look”.

Participant 4

The revision made by participant 4 was almost the same as Participant 3. He revised sentence 2 in changing “his” to “the”. In sentence 3, he changed article “a” to pronoun “his”. In the sentence 6, he revised the use of “to just look” into “just to look”.

Participant 5

Participant 5 revised three out of eight sentences. She revised sentence 3, 6 and 8. In sentence 3, she changed article “a” to pronoun “his”. In the sentence 6, she changed the word order from “to just look” to “just to look”. In the last sentence, she made two points of omission. The first one was that she omitted the word “just” and the second one was that she omitted the redundant use of noun “grandparents”.

Participant 6

Participant 6 made some revision of grammar points and diction. Related to grammar, he changed pronoun “his” to the article “the”, adjective “blinded” to blind and noun phrase “his breath” to “just breathing. In the diction choice, he changed adverb “gradually” to “slowly” and noun “passion” to “enthusiasm”.

Participant 7

Participant 7 revised four sentences—1, 4, 7, and 8. In the sentence 1 and 8, she revised the diction points, such as the prepositional phrase “in his bed” to “in his place” and noun “sheet” to “piece”. She made the omission of the pronoun “his” in “for his breath”. The last was a revision in grammar in which she altered verb “erased” to “erase”.

Participant 8

Participant 8 revised two grammar points, two diction points, and one omission. The grammar revisions were in the sentence 4, 5 and 8 with the change of verb “stops” to “stop” in the sentence 4. The next change lied on the sentence form. In the sentence 5, she changed from “The distance of the market *is quite far as it has become* very close in the eyes of the grandfather” to “The distance of the market *which is quite far become* so close in his eyes”. The last grammar revision was in the sentence 8 in which she changed modal verb “can” to its past form “could”. Then, she also omitted some part of a prepositional phrase from “in the eyes of the grandfather” to “in his eyes”. The next omission has appeared in the last sentence in which she omitted “already” from “can already smile”. The changes of diction have appeared in sentence 5 in which she altered “very” with “so”. The next change has appeared in sentence 8 in which she changed noun “sheet” to “piece”.

Participant 9

Participant 9 did not make any revision of grammar but he revised diction and made omission. The change of diction was made on sentence 4 in which he changed “while” to “in”. He also omitted the word “just” in “to just look” in the sentence 8.

DISCUSSIONS

In this section, the results are summarized based on the research questions. Those research questions are How far is the student teachers’ sensitivity towards the errors of Google Translate results? (1) How is the student teachers’ language awareness with reference to their revision to Google Translate results? (2). The results are summarized in some ways.

Firstly, the frequency of revisions made by the participants shows the sensitivity they have towards the errors in the Google Translate results. From Table 1, the frequency of the revision made by the participants was 37.5 % which means each participant only revised 3 to 4 sentences of average. The most highly frequent revisions were made by participant 1 with percentage 75% in which she revised 6 sentences out of all 8 sentences. The lowest frequency of revisions was made by participant 9 in which there were only 2 sentences revised with percentage 25%. The other participants revised between 2 to five sentences. Then, based on the frequency of revisions, most of the participants have limited sensitivity to the errors.

Secondly, based on the cognitive categories of revisions from Lindgren and Sullivan (2006), the revisions made by the participants lied on mostly in grammar category. From Table 2, the total revisions are 41 points with 24 points in grammar category. As it is stated by Lindgren and Sullivan (2006), the revisions which cannot be categorized into conceptual categories included in the “others”. The revisions categorized in the “others” category are omission and dictions. The participants made 6 points of omission in total while there were 11 points of diction. The omission and diction show that the participants recognized the mistranslation errors. In brief, the participants’ revisions represent their sensitivity towards grammar and mistranslation errors although it is not significant.

Thirdly, according to Dahaj (2012), the errors of the final product may represent the language awareness. Then, the detailed analysis of the errors’ revisions made by participants determines their degree of language awareness. The detailed errors’ revision will be based on the type of translation errors from Naqvy (2006). As it is explained before, the errors which were revised by the participants were grammar and mistranslation. The detailed analysis is summarized below.

According to grammar errors, the participants revised the grammar errors but it led to the other errors. Take examples sentence 3, participant 1 revised the Google Translate result “the old grandfather began to pedal a bicycle that may be almost the same age as his age with his zeal as if he were young”. She revised it into “the old grandfather began to pedal his bicycle that may be his age was almost the same as his young age”. The revision she made led to the other meaning and also grammar error. The revision showed the intention of participant 1 who mentioned that the old man felt like he was young. Meanwhile, the original Indonesian text wants to tell that the bicycle is as older as his age and he pedals the bicycle with the passion as if he were young.

Another revision which results in the other error occurred in the revision of Participant 8. She made a revision on the verb “stops” by changing it into the verb “stop”. The participant had recognized the error of the use of present form.

She intended to change it to its past form. Unfortunately, her revision led to other error since the past form of the verb “stop” is “stopped”. It showed that the participant 8 still did not know the past form of verb stop.

Omission and dictions changing are included in mistranslation since the participants made those revisions as a result of mistranslation recognition. It relates to the revision on meaning-preserving as Dahaj (2012) also gave attention to meaning preserving inform revision. The highest frequent diction changing is in the sentence 2 in which there were four participants (Participant 1, 3, 4, 6) recognizing this mistranslation. The participants changed the use of the pronoun “his” to an article “the” and “that” since the pronoun “his” did not have any reference to any previous noun. The same revision also occurred in sentence 3 in which four participants (Participant 1, 3, 4, 5) changed article “a” to pronoun “his” since the bicycle owned by the old man. These revisions showed that some of the participants recognize mistranslation although it was still light part in the area of meaning-preserving.

Related to localization errors, there was only one participant who recognized it. For instance, sentence 1 “the sun had not been in his bed”, it contains localization errors since it is Indonesian metaphor which is not natural in the English context. Although participant 1 recognized this error, she revised it into “the sun had not rised yet”. Unfortunately, the revision led to grammar error. She used the word “rised” for replacing the participle form of verb “rise” which it should be “risen”. Then, it showed that the participant did not know the past form of the verb rise.

In brief, the participants’ language sensitivity towards the errors of Google Translate results is inadequate based on the analysis of revision frequency and revision categories. Regarding revision frequency, the participants recognized limited errors. From 8 sentences, most of the participants ignore errors occurred in most sentences. It seemed that they did not recognize the errors and left them as it was. In the term of revision categories, the participants performed revision mostly on the grammar and restricted omission and diction. Most participants did not recognize major mistranslation, localization errors and errors of inconsistency.

With reference to the result of participants’ sensitivity on errors and the analysis of type errors of revisions they made represented the narrow language awareness. It is stated by Dahaj (2012, p 34) that “revisions highlight areas that trigger language awareness/monitoring”. The revisions on grammar errors led to the other errors. The same thing occurred on localization errors in which the participant’s revision became a grammar error. In mistranslation, the participants performed a revision on diction and omission which lied on the small part of preserving the meaning. At last, they did not recognize any inconsistency error in Google Translate results. Those results could be references to the lack of language awareness.

CONCLUSIONS

Language awareness is a core aspect of designing language teaching, and learning process. It involves the language, its teaching and its learning. It means that the teacher who wants to have a successful language teaching and learning process needs to consider his ability in using the language, teaching the language and understanding how students learn the language. Those abilities need to be developed since they are in language education academy. The institution which provides the language education also is required to maintain language awareness of student teachers.

This study aimed to investigate the student teachers’ language awareness through analyzing the revision the student teachers made on Google Translate result. The student teachers’ sensitivity was analyzed first to see whether they were aware of the errors made by Google Translate. Through the revision detailed analysis, language awareness was

analyzed and summarized. The detailed analysis was based on revision category of Lindgren and Sullivan (2006) and the translation error categories by Naqvy (2016).

The results showed that the student teacher had limited sensitivity toward errors of Google Translate. Most of them left the sentences without any revision. They did not recognize any errors in the translation results from Google Translate. The type of revision they made lied on grammar mostly and some on diction and omission. The translation error revisions appeared on the data was grammar errors, mistranslation and localization errors. The revision made on grammar errors led to the other errors. Related to mistranslation issues, most of the participants revised the misuse of article and pronoun which means that it is still a small part of the translation process. In localization errors, only one participant recognized this error and revised it but the revision turned to grammar error. Then, it can be concluded that the student teachers' language awareness is limited which is the same line with their error sensitivity.

Based on those results, it is recommended for all institutions which provide language education need to pay attention to maintaining language awareness of the student teachers. With reference to the importance of language awareness, the evaluation of student teachers' language awareness is significantly important to monitor the development they had. This evaluation may give some insight for the stakeholders to determine the aspects which influence the development of language awareness. Then, it can be followed by the training or program which has the purpose to increase language awareness is also necessary to be planned to keep the development of student teachers' language awareness. Such collaborative evaluation and training will give a positive effect on the student teachers' language awareness.

Since the participants were second- semester students, it can be said that they have not developed their language awareness well yet. Then, this study may give some reflection for the stakeholder to start paying attention to the development of language awareness of student teachers for the next semester. On the other hand, this study can also be a trigger for the other researchers to conduct the same research with the wider scope of participants. It may give a broad point a view toward the issues and possibly catch other phenomena. Moreover, this study may be able to be the foundation of other research on the same issues.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to deliver my deepest gratitude for my sponsorship, Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) for giving me support financially to undergo this research.

REFERENCES

1. AdibiDahaj, M. (2012). *Analyzing learners' language awareness in written production: product-oriented vs. process-oriented approaches*.
2. Ballantyne, N. (2015). *Skype's Real Time Translator - the end of language teaching*. Retrieved May 2017, from British Council: <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/skypes-real-time-translator-end-language-learning>
3. BaşyurtTüzel, A. E., &Akcan, S. (2009). *Raising the language awareness of pre-service English teachers in an EFL context*. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 271-287.
4. Bell, R. (1991) *Translation and Translating*. London: Longman.
5. Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanič, R., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). *Ten questions about language awareness*. *ELT journal*, 57(3), 251-259.

6. Faber, Pamela. 1998. *Translation Competence and Language Awareness*. *Language Awareness*, 7(1), 9-21. Doi:10.1080/09658419808667097
7. Farahian, M., & Rezaee, M. (2015). *Language Awareness in EFL Context: An Overview*. *International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*. Vol.2, No.2, 2015, p.19-21
8. Garcia, O. (2008). *Multilingual language awareness and teacher education*. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 2130-2145). Springer US.
9. Kaufmann, S. (2015). *Automatic Translation Technology– Replacing Language Learning?* Retrieved May 2017, from *The Linguist*: <https://blog.thelinguist.com/automatic-translation-technology-replacing-language-learning>
10. Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). *Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness I*. *Language awareness*, 3(2), 73-93.
11. Taghieh, Mohammad Reza. "The Language Poets Heart and Thought with a Different Language and Culture."
12. Lindgren, E., & Sullivan, K. P. H (2006). *Writing and the analysis of revision: An overview*. In: G. Rijlaarsdam (Series Ed.) and K. P. H. Sullivan, & E. Lindgren (Vol. Eds.), *Studies in Writing*, Vol.18, *Computer Keystroke Logging: Methods and Applications*, (pp.31-44). Oxford: Elsevier.
13. Mok, J. (2013). *A case study of developing student-teachers' language awareness through online discussion forums*. *Language Awareness*, 22(2), 161-175.
14. Rani, Yedidi Mercy. "Discussion of Socio-Cultural and Psychological Factors on Language Acquisition with Special Reference to Omani Learners."
15. Naqvy, R. (2006). *A Beginner's Guide to Translation Errors*. Retrieved May 2017, from *ProZ.com - The translation workplace*: <http://www.proz.com/translation-articles/articles/619/1/A-Beginner%27s-Guide-to-Translation-Errors>
16. Permendiknas. (2016). *Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 22 Tahun 2016 tentang Standar Proses pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*. Jakarta: Kemendiknas
17. Thorn bury, S. (1997). *About Language: Tasks for Teachers of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
18. Wilss, W. (1994) *A framework for decision-making in translation*. *Target* 6,131-50.
19. Xerri, D., Bei, F., Molina, S. C., Spiteri, D., & Chick, M. (2015). *Developing Teacher Language Awareness Via In-Service Training: Trainers' beliefs*. *Elted Vol.18*. Academia.edu

